1960-61

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Wesleyan STUDIES in RELIGION

- **COMMUNION WITH GOD**
  by Jose A. Franquiz
- **QUMRAN AND THE OLD TESTAMENT**
  by Howard M. Teeple
- **REVIVALISM AMONG THE METHODISTS**
  by Kenneth M. Plummer
- **DOES RELIGION ELUDE SCIENTIFIC NETS?**
  by Paul E. Johnson

WESLEYAN STUDIES IN RELIGION

WEST VIRGINIA WESLEYAN COLLEGE • BUCKHANNON, WEST VIRGINIA

Vol. 53, No. 6 1960-61 Serial No. 339

89160

v. 53-59
1960/61-1966/67

CONTENTS:

3 **THE RELIGIOUS TRADITION AT WESLEYAN**

5 **COMMUNION WITH GOD**
by Jose A. Franquiz

13 **QUMRAN AND THE OLD TESTAMENT**
by Howard M. Teeple

18 **REVIVALISM AMONG THE METHODISTS**
by Kenneth M. Plummer

27 **DOES RELIGION ELUDE SCIENTIFIC NETS?**
by Paul E. Johnson

30 **BOOK REVIEWS**

34 **BOOK NOTICES**

36 **BOOKS RECEIVED**

EDITORS:

Walter R. Collins, *Director of Publications*
Orlo Strunk, Jr., *Dean of the College*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

Herbert J. Buhler, Jr., Sidney T. Davis, Jose A. Franquiz, Jay V. Groves, Kenneth M. Plummer, Howard M. Teeple

ALUMNI ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

Garrett H. Evans, George D. Goodwin, Joseph C. Hoffman, A. Argyle Knight, William D. Nietmann, Ronald E. Sleeth, Amos A. Thornburg, Dale E. Turner

The West Virginia Wesleyan College Bulletin, published monthly during the college year, except December, by West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, West Virginia. Entered as second-class matter February 28, 1917, at the post office at Buckhannon, West Virginia, under the act of Congress of August 24, 1912.

Wesleyan STUDIES in RELIGION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/wesleyan-studies-religion_1960-1961_53_6

The Religious Tradition At Wesleyan

There is really nothing particularly startling or unusual about initiating a scholarly journal devoted to the publishing of religious studies. The current avalanche of journals is indicative of the wide interest being expressed in this area. Indeed, what is unusual about our new journal is that it was not started a long time ago, for Wesleyan's tradition in the area of religious studies is a long and intense one, almost demanding expression beyond the customary classroom and chapel atmosphere. And though an *undergraduate* publication of this nature is something of a rarity, there is every reason to believe that West Virginia Wesleyan College has the necessary resources and personnel to publish a significant journal for its constituency.

The richness of the religious sophistication on WVWC's faculty is amply demonstrated by the members of the Editorial Committee, all of whom hold advanced degrees in religious areas. Equally symptomatic is the impressive list of Wesleyan alumni who have responded to our request to serve in an advisory capacity. All of these gentlemen hold important posts in professional religious work: *Garrett H. Evans* is Minister of the First Methodist Church in Huntington, West Virginia; *George D. Goodwin* is Minister of the Central Methodist Church in Stockton, California; *Joseph C. Hoffman* is Minister of the First Methodist

Church in Galesburg, Illinois; *A. Argyle Knight* is with the Youth Department of the General Board of Education of The Methodist Church; *William D. Nietmann* is Professor of Philosophy at the College of the Pacific in Stockton, California; *Ronald E. Sleeth* is Professor of Preaching at Vanderbilt University; *Amos A. Thornburg* is Minister of Trinity Methodist Church in Chicago; and *Dale E. Turner* is Minister of University Congregational Church in Seattle, Washington.

It is appropriate that three of the four major articles in this first issue are written by faculty members. *Howard M. Teeple* is Associate Professor of Religion, having joined the Wesleyan faculty in 1958. A Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, Dr. Teeple has an impressive knowledge of biblical material, especially textual criticism. His "Qumran and the Old Testament" is indicative of his scholarship.

José A. Fránquiz came to West Virginia Wesleyan College in 1946 and has taught philosophy since that time. He is a prolific writer and is frequently invited to present papers to national and international scholarly societies. His study "Communion with God" was originally entitled "Psychology and Metaphysics of the Experience of Communion with God" and was read before the Southern Society for Philosophy of Religion.

In the summer of 1959, the Library of Religion of West Virginia Wesleyan College was established in The Methodist Historical Room of the Annie Merner Pfeiffer Library, and *Dr. Kenneth M. Plummer* was appointed Director. In this first issue of *Wesleyan Studies in Religion,* Dr. Plummer writes on revivalism among the Methodists along the Ohio in Western Virginia between 1800 and 1825.

"Does Religion Elude Scientific Nets?" by *Dr. Paul E. Johnson* was originally given as an address before the Nineteenth Meeting of The Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, held at Yale University on October 30-31, 1959. Dr. Johnson is Albert V. Danielsen Professor of Psychology and Pastoral Counseling at Boston University School of Theology.

Though we shall continue to publish articles and reviews by WVWC faculty members and alumni, the 1961 issue of *Wesleyan Studies in Religion* will contain two articles by prominent theologians outside the immediate college community. *The Reverend Professor J. Edward Dirks* of Yale University will give The Schoolcraft Lecture on October 14, 1960. This lecture, entitled "The Pursuit of Learning to the Glory of God," will be published in the 1961 issue of *WSIR*.

"The Christian Faith and Reason" is the title of the 1961 Windover Hills Lecture in Religion to be given on February 9 by *Dr. Nels F. S. Ferré*. It, too, will be printed in the 1961 issue.

This first issue of *Wesleyan Studies in Religion* has been sent to all theological school libraries in the United States, all Methodist college libraries, faculty and trustees of WVWC, all Methodist ministers in the West Virginia area and all majors in Bible, Religion, Philosophy, and Religious Education currently enrolled at WVWC.

The hope is that this new publication will add still another dimension to our educational ventures and will represent one more attempt to make the vision clear.

O.S.

Communion with God

Jose A Franquiz

According to Webster, "Mysticism is the doctrine or belief that direct knowledge of God or spiritual truth or ultimate reality, is attainable through immediate intuition, insight or illumination, and in a way, differing from ordinary sense perception or ratiocination . . . Hence (it is another name for) vague speculation, vagary, belief without foundation." As rare synonyms of "mystical," Webster mentions the following: "Remote from ordinary human knowledge or comprehension, unintelligible, cryptic, enigmatic, obscure, ocult, cabalistic."[1] Logical positivism and most of the forms of naturalism would have called mysticism simply a pseudo-problem or an instance of nonsense. But our standard dictionary merely suggests the expressions "vague speculation," "vagary," and "belief without foundation."

It is not the purpose of the present paper to condemn or applaud the foregoing concepts of mysticism. Indeed our study will not be an investigation of mysticism *per se*. Nor will it be an inquiry into prayer. It will be simply a general consideration of some of the factors and circumstances attending those experiences which man has consistently called instances of communion with God. Our purpose, then, is to inquire into the "vagueness" of man's attempt to transcend himself. But such an inquiry would of necessity have to touch on the fields of mysticism, faith, worship and prayer. The general character of our topic, therefore, will permit us to move freely among these concepts, and dispense with an unnecessary exhaustive list of the recognized literature on the field.

At the outset, the very idea of communion with God seems to beg the question, and from a strictly rationalistic point of view probably it does; but were we to validate with nicest accuracy each one of our concepts, our discussion would not progress very far. Within the scope of our short paper we cannot undertake to prove the existence of God. God must be assumed. Any other approach would take us far off into the entanglements of theological dialectics. The following comment from the great English idealist, Norman Kemp Smith, states our attitude succinctly: "It is no longer regarded as possible to demonstrate by dialectical argument the existence of God. It is recognized that the so-called proofs are at best merely outline indications of the various directions in which demonstrations are to be sought. It is in the highly specific facts

of religious experience in the past and in the present, in their coordination with the other aspects of life, and through study of them in all the detail of their historical accompaniments, that the evidence—if adequate theoretical evidence there be—is alone to be found."[2] The British philosopher follows pretty closely the thought of Borden Parker Bowne who many years before, referring to the arguments for the existence of God, declared that "carefully considered (they) turn out to fall short of demonstration . . . Matters of fact do not admit of demonstration in any case. Demonstration attaches only to the formal science like mathematics which deals with the relation of ideas. Whenever we come to consider concrete reality there is always an element of assumption in any so-called demonstration."[3] Our dynamic conception of reason or "coherence at work," however, liberates us from strict rationalism, and therefore, at least for the time being, we may safely overlook the apparent *petitio principii* implied in the title of this paper.

John Oman distinguishes between four types of knowing, namely: awareness, apprehension, comprehension and explanation. The difference and relationship between these types he illustrates as follows: "While walking in a dreamy mood along a country road, we may have a vivid sense of all that is about us, without attending to anything in particular. Our knowing is then a general field of *awareness,* including scent and sound as well as sight. The more we are entirely in this state of awareness, the more all our senses are active, so that we may even have vague realization of the taste of the apples in the orchards and the coolness of the waters in the streams. Something in this field arouses particular attention, say an object moving toward us on the road. If it specially interests us, as, for example, by being unfamiliar, we concentrate attention on it to see exactly what it is, seeking to *apprehend* it as one object by what appears to be its more relevant and important details. Let us say that we apprehend it to be a man riding a bicycle. Then, supposing we have none of the information we afterwards learn to include under the name bicycle, but have everything to learn about it, we try, as it approaches, to *comprehend* it. This we do by considering the machine in relation to the man as a means of locomotion . . . Finally, as it passes, we are faced by the problem that it seems to have no support from its breadth, yet keeps upright while traveling along a line. This singularity we try to *explain*: and we do it with such general principles as the scientific knowledge we happen to possess provides."[4]

Oman would be the first to grant the interrelatedness of his four types of knowing. Indeed they intercoalesce and support each other, and belonging together their division should not be carried too far. Yet, they are sufficiently unique to be distinguished.

Applying Oman's criteria we may say that communion with God is a manner of *explanation.* But it is not scientific explanation. Much less is it the type of scientific explanation which consists in explaining away. It is a type of explanation to one's self which consists of the awareness of certainty. It is also a manner of *comprehending,* but its comprehension is not a matter of adding information and compiling data. It is not a procedure, but an attitude. Communion with God is also *apprehension,* but not the appre-

hension of a thing or an object. It is rather an apprehension of meaning, novelty and joy. It is an apprehension of self-discovery and self-experience. Communion with God is, finally, intensified *awareness,* but not awareness of mere concreteness. It is the awareness of ultimacy and the experience of an objective presence. In terms of our study, explanation clarifies comprehension; comprehension strengthens apprehension; and apprehension anticipates and leads to ultimate awareness. *Awareness,* on the other hand, animates apprehension; *apprehension* illuminates comprehension; and *comprehension* unfolds in *explaining.* In this sense, awareness of the ultimate is dialectical. It is a gradual growth that ascends in search of ever higher syntheses and climbs to the loftiest and most inclusive universal; but always returns to the point of departure, to specificity and particularity. If mystical experience evidences itself by any distinctive quality, it is by the quality of life to which the experience leads. The mystic's euphoric feeling and awareness of ultimacy is never a mountain-top experience only. Indeed the experience itself, whether it is a feeling or a vision or an ecstasy or a mood, does not last for more than two hours.[5] What is peculiar about the experience is that it enriches life, charging it with a sense of vision and mission.

Mysticism in itself not being the central object of our study, it will be unnecessary for us to digress into the psychology and physiology of mystical experience. James H. Leuba's famous observation that mystical ecstasy can be induced by the use of certain drugs,[6] would be, therefore, irrelevant to our problem. Leuba certainly knows what he is talking about, but inasmuch as by religion he seems to mean simply what we call superficial and crude evangelism, we can dispense with his psychology, and philosophically realize that the origin or even the history of an experience has nothing to do with its logical validity. This would also apply to cases of self-hypnosis, glossolalia, hallucinations and the other religious phenomena with hysteric foundation. The type of religious experience a person has depends primarily upon what the person is. The psychological make-up of the individual determines to a great extent not only the manner in which he experiences the religious, but also the manner in which he experiences anything in life. No other psychologist has established this fact so fruitfully and constructively as Gordon W. Allport in his personalistic psychology,[7] although long before Allport, William James had suggested the same insight by his well known classification of individuals as *tender-minded* and *tough-minded.* The tough-minded or healthy-minded soul experiences religion without a conversion crisis, while the tender-minded or sick soul needs a radical crisis to achieve integration and peace of mind.[8] Even before William James, George A. Coe wrote about the influence of individual temperament and of social factors on religious experience.

This situation sheds light upon what, in the judgment of Bowne, constitutes the three types of Christian discipleship. Obedience, we are told, is the supreme test of religion. The Lord requires of us simply the filial spirit issuing in lives of obedience to his commandments (I John 2:3-4). This is the ethical type of discipleship. For it religion is righteousness. It is the moral law conceived as the will of God. Communion with the eternal is

not a matter of "fervors, deep meditations or flaming raptures, but of loyalty to righteousness." "Communion with God is moral goodness, and this is the religion of most thoughtful young people of wholesome moral training and habits. Indeed this is also the religion of the Synoptic Gospels and of St. James' epistle. . . ."[9]

There are other persons, however, Bowne observes, to whom this phase of Christian doctrine is far from satisfactory. For these, the law is more than a rule to be fulfilled. It is a spirit which can never be exhausted in man's experience of righteousness. These individuals have to be taken out of themselves and taught that they are saved by grace through faith. But such persons are not immoral. Frequently they are even more moral than any other type; simply they can never rest in the satisfying contemplation of their behavior.

There is, however, a deeper religious need which neither of the preceding types of discipleship seems to satisfy. Man experiences a yearning for oneness and fellowship with the eternal. And nothing whatsoever can take its place. But there's the rub! Bowne alludes to this type of experience in a casual fashion, almost disparagingly. It is true that he recognizes the foregoing three types of discipleship, and observes that the three are present in the New Testament and in the history of the church. Indeed we are told that they are implicit in the religious nature itself, and that they would find expression in every Christian, if men were perfect. ". . . But all these types have to be tested by righteousness. Otherwise salvation by faith may easily pass into immorality, and fervor may issue in practical indifference to the work of the world. The only way in which we can escape these dangers is by beginning with the moral type and keeping the commandments of God. There is no other requirement and no other may be imposed."[10]

Fundamentally there is no major disagreement between our position and that of Borden Parker Bowne. Morality and religion cannot be divorced. But there is always the danger of anthropocentrism. Humanism and most of the other forms of naturalism are as much concerned for the moral improvement of the human race as Bowne or any other personalist ever was. Instead of religious experience being grounded on man's moral nature and needs, we find the roots of morality historically and metaphysically grounded in the religious nature of man. A morality imported externally does not necessarily flower out into religion from within; but when the inner life is genuinely religious it unfolds in moral behavior. Indeed the injunction of both the Old and the New Testaments is not so much to be good as to be holy. These few words might easily spell the difference between religion and secularism, and also between a spiritualistic metaphysics and a naturalistic outlook.

Rather than undemine with Bowne, therefore, the importance of his third type of discipleship, from our point of view we stress its primacy. If God is the ultimately real, thirst for fellowship with Him here and now in the manner of the vine and the branches is itself the mature religious sentiment, regardless of how we phrase the experience of it. Spinoza calls it intellectual love of God; Schleiermacher, the sense of absolute dependence of God; Rudolph Otto, *mysterium tremendum, luminosum et fascinosum;* and even John Dewey speaks of "the personal experience of totality . . . sublime joy of emancipa-

tion in whose presence one is immortal within the life of the universal."[11] The manner in which the experience of the religious sentiment is phrased is inconsequential. Irrelevant may also be the hysterical exaggerations into which the sentiment may finally degenerate. The ecstasies of St. Teresa, the visions of Ignace of Loyola, the hallucinations of St. John of the Cross, the frightful experience of Boehme, the burning bush of Moses, the call of Isaiah, Paul's event on the road to Damascus, and so many others, would naturally depend upon the psychological constitution of the persons experiencing the mystical rapture and also upon the conditions, traditions, and religious expectations of society at the time those experiences took place. These external forms and manifestations are matters of abnormal psychology and psychiatry. What is of metaphysical relevance is that man longs for totality, that in-some way he experiences the satisfaction of this need, and once having his need satisfied, his experience unfolds in constructive social action. The religious sentiment, therefore, at least in the foregoing sense, is akin to the type of knowing which John Oman calls *Awareness.*[12]

Most of our discussion this far has centered, however, upon the problematics of the religious sentiment and its conditions. But communion with God is neither a sentiment nor a condition. It is an act: indeed, the most important act of man. It is life. If there is no God, communion is a misnomer. But if there is God, there is no substitute for the value of communion with Him. Communion, however, involves two parties. It is a dialogue, a meeting, an encounter,[13] It is an "I-Thou" relationship, to use Buber's phrase, a subject-object situation. Only persons commune and communicate. Communion with God presupposes, therefore, both the personality of man and the personality of God. Man does not commune with process or evolution or atomic energy. He communes with God. But if God does not commune with man, there is no communion either. Communion, therefore, rests upon God's revelation and man's transcendence. Failure to emphasize the revelation of God will make of religious experience a case of wishful thinking, a mechanism of projection. But failure to emphasize man's transcendence will cancel the human spirit, for, as Francisco Romero has admirably shown,[14] transcendence is the essence of spirituality.

The difficulties involved in the problematics of revelation are too numerous and complex; but revelation as a fact must be faced, lest by shunning it we render communion with God an inarticulate and meaningless expression. For the purpose of our study let us limit our inquiry to two related questions: in revelation, what is it that God reveals, and how does revelation take place? An answer to these questions will shed light upon the objective aspect of the subject-object situation which constitutes the I-Thou event of communion with God. Concerning revelation, the believer thinks at once of sacred writings, each religion considering its own sacred books more meaningful and inspired than the literature of the other religions. This is what Professor Brightman calls the dogmatic conception of revelation, which makes it consist of "the communication of supernatural and infallible truths or dogmas . . . thought of as propositions which the natural reason could never arrive at by reflection on ordinary experience."[15] But even within the various religious

bodies themselves there are wide differences of opinion as to the manner in which the scriptures are to be understood and accepted. If our inquiry is not to end in a chaotic religious relativism, we must look at all sacred writings from the point of view of the spiritual function they perform. As such, all sacred writings, the *Bible, Koran, Tao Teh King, The Book of the Dead,* and many others, have in common man's need and longing for the Eternal and the purpose of bringing him nearer to God. This is the revelation. Professor Brightman's insight helps us also concerning the second question as to the manner in which revelation takes place. He suggests what he calls the teleological or dynamic theory of revelation. According to this view, "the essence of revelation is not the communication of infallible truths; instead it is the guidance of human life to higher levels by divine power . . . The divine purpose so acts in human history that men are given impulses which lead them to move toward God. . . . This dynamic view makes revelation an experience of the power and active purpose of God rather than an experience of God's knowledge. . . . Experience on this view, includes many factors which are revelatory in the sense of being purposed by God in order to lead men to higher values; yet all these factors must be interpreted by reason, and the interpretation is human thinking, not divine dogma."[16]

In our discussion of the religious sentiment[17] we anticipated most of what we could call the subjective side of the subject-object situation which constitutes the I-Thou event of communion between man and the eternal; but our stress lay on the sentiment and not on the individual. The sentiment by itself, however, apart from the tensional life of the individual is an abstraction. The subject must be treated in terms of concrete personality, for without personality at both ends there is no communion.

Commenting approvingly on Schleiermacher's concept of absolute dependence as "the most exact and profound explanation" of religious experience, Miguel de Unamuno concludes that the concept of the divine emerged in man by way of psychological projection. The concept originated in feeling.[18] This statement antedates, of course, the time of Freud, and its meaning must not be confused with the Freudian "fatherhood complex," for Unamuno is not doing away with God. He is primarily concerned with the manner in which men come to hunger for God and experience His reality. But in his study, Unamuno prepares the way for a great deal of modern psychology of religion.

In a recent paper Paul E. Johnson observes that "our effort to communicate (represents) a precarious hopeful attempt to overcome our lonely isolation by completing even for a moment a circuit of wholeness. . . ."[19] It is true that Johnson is referring here not to cosmic totality, but to the social wholeness "in which we join our hidden differences in a common experience of understanding." But is it not true that man is also a lonesome individual in the cosmos? He may not feel his universal loneliness all the time, but in the presence of death and suffering, in his realization of helplessness and impotence, he ponders and wonders. Might this not be what Schopenhauer meant when he claimed that had it not been for death and suffering there would be no philosophy? When Plato affirmed that philosophy begins in wonder, probably he

also was referring to man's sense of ultimate despair. Against the background of the cosmos, man is a lonely individual, and religion is the consolation that wells up from the core of his being when his heart bursts in his aloneness. We can sympathetically understand Unamuno, therefore, when he insists that if there is not a God we must make one. Two profound utterances of Whitehead illumine our thought in this connection: "Religion is what man does with his solitariness," and also, "Religion is the passage from God the void to God the enemy and from Him to God the companion." Somewhat differently but with a tint of the paradoxical, Hocking expresses this same existential imperative of the divine, when he asserts that because the world is, *God is*: and because the world is not, *God is*.[20] There is in man, then, a yearning for what John Dewey called "personal freedom and peace of the individual within the harmony of infinite totality."[21]

It is this yearning for totality, or "basic need for relatedness" as Johnson calls it, that motivates the effort to communicate and commune. With the exception of the extreme pluralistic psychologists like James, Dunlap, Angyal, McDougall, and Murray, who deny uniqueness and universality to this or any other form of religious sentiment, most modern psychologists and philosophers prefer to establish specific norms for the religious emotion. Bowne bases it on obedience to the commandments of God; Barth and his followers, on direct revelation "from above;" Wobbermin grounds it on the experience of longing and the need for security; Rudolph Otto, on the *numinous,* or feeling of creaturehood; Romero, on transcendence; Heidegger and his followers, on concern and dread; Knudson, Troeltsch and other apriorists, on man's native capacity for religious experience; and Gordon W. Allport, on a type of functional autonomy of motives which regardless of the origin becomes like all master sentiments, well differentiated, dynamic, consistently directive, comprehensive and harmonious.[22]

Gathering now together the fruits of our investigation we find by way of summary that communion with God belongs in the field of mystical experience, and mysticism, like all religious experience, contains a peripheral fringe of abnormality as well as a healthy, vigorous center of genuine penetrating insight. Whether on the fringe or in the center, the quality of religious experience depends upon the maturity and psychological make-up of the individual. The test of the genuineness of religious experience, regardless how mystical, is the character of social action to which it leads. Not only different individuals may have different types of religious awareness, but also an individual himself may have different types of religious experience.

In our paper we have treated also the uniqueness of the religious sentiment as a basis of the religious life, and finally we proceeded to a separate consideration of the object and the subject of the experience in communion. The object, God, provided us with a *beyond*. The subject, man, provided us with a *within*. Borrowing the joyful expression of Rufus Jones and applying it to our investigation, we find that communion with God is the experience of *a beyond that is within,* but not to the extent of either an epistemic or an ontological sameness.[23] It is a union, not a unity; a fellowship, not an identity. It is a meeting which begins with dialogue and culminates in partnership; a

trembling soul fearfully trying to say, "Thou madest me for thyself, and my heart is restless until it finds repose in Thee;" and Love eternal whispering quietly, "Thou wouldst not seek me if thou hadst not already found me."

NOTES

1. Merriam-Webster, *New International Dictionary* (2nd Edition, Unabridged, Vol. III. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company, Publishers, 1959), p. 1621.

2. Norman Kemp Smith, "The Present Situation in Philosophy, *"Philosophical Review,* XXIX (January, 1920), p. 24.

3. Cp. Borden Parker Bowne, *Kant and Spencer* (Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1912), p. 207.

4. John Oman, *The Natural and the Supernatural* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931), pp. 120-121.

5. William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902), p. 38.

6. James H. Leuba, *The Psychology of Religious Mysticism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1925), Chap. ii. Also cp. James, *op. cit.,* pp. 386-387, 390-392.

7. Gordon W. Allport, *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1937); *The Individual and His Religion* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950); *The Roots of Religion* (New York: National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1944).

8. James, *op. cit.,* pp. 78-165.

9. Borden Parker Bowne, *The Essence of Religion* (Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1910), pp. 229-231.

10. *ibid.,* pp. 231-232.

11. John Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct.* An Introduction to Social Psychology. (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1922), pp. 330-332.

12. *supra.*

13. Cp. Martin Buber, *I and Thou (New* York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937); *Eclipse of God* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1952).

14. Francisco Romero, *Filosofia de la Persona* (Buenos Aires: Talleres Graficos Radio Popular, 1938); *Teoria del Hombre* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, 1952). Also, Jose A. Franquiz, "Personalistic Structuralism of Francisco Romero," *Luminar,* II (Spring, 1940), pp. 252-275; and Jose A. Franquiz, "Personalism in Latin American," *The Philosophical Forum,* XII (1954), pp. 77-78.

15. Edgar S. Brightman, *Philosophy of Religion* (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1940), p. 175.

16. *ibid.,* p. 176.

17. *supra.*

18. Miguel de Unamuno, "From God to God," *Sentimiento Tragico de la Vida,,* (Madrid: Renacimiento, S. A., 1914), pp. 156-184.

19. Paul E. Johnson, "How Do We Communicate?" (Unpublished paper read at Bryn Mawr College, Dec. 27, 1951); cf. also Paul E. Johnson, *Psychology of Religion* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1945), Chaps. ii, v, vi, vii.

20. William Ernest Hocking, *The Meaning of God in Human Experience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912), p. 312.

21. John Dewey, *loc. cit.*

22. Gordon W. Allport, *The Individual and His Religion,* pp. 57-74; *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation,* pp. 213-231; *The Roots of Religion,* pp. 3-30.

23. For a lucid discussion of this point, cp. Albert C. Knudson, *The Validity of Religious Experience* (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1937), Chap. ii; also, Edgar S. Brightman, *op. cit.,* pp. 168-171.

Qumran and the Old Testament

Howard M. Teeple

Before entering college most freshmen have heard of very few of the discoveries which have transformed biblical study in the last hundred years. There is one topic, however, of which many freshmen have heard: the Dead Sea scrolls. Some have the mistaken idea that they are Christian writings, but at least these students have heard of them.

There are numerous other archeological discoveries which are just as important for biblical study, but the Dead Sea scrolls are widely known because they have been reported repeatedly in the newspapers. This has occurred because opposing views of their significance and date of origin quickly made them controversial. Some of the controversies were over matters of deep concern, and once they were called to the attention of the public, they could hardly be ignored.

There are two groups or categories of the Dead Sea scrolls, and each group has its own type of significance. One category consists of the canonical books, i.e., those in the Old Testament. The other group of the scrolls consists of the non-canonical books. The majority of the latter were written by the members of the sect and reveal their religious ideas. At first after the initial discoveries at Qumran scholars referred to the sect as "the Covenanters," but now it is generally recognized that this religious community was the Essene sect or at least a branch of it.

The Old Testament manuscripts found at Qumran have not been as controversial as the sect's own writings, and consequently their significance is often overlooked. In this article attention will be focused on the significance of this category of the Dead Sea scrolls, particularly in respect to the canon and the text of the Old Testament.

Earlier Manuscripts of the Old Testament

Prior to the discoveries at Qumran no Old Testament manuscripts written before the Christian era were known. Now we have many such manuscripts or fragments of manuscripts. Most of these scrolls were written in the first centuries B. C. and A. D. The oldest biblical manuscript found at Qumran—and hence the oldest one known today—is 4QSam^{b}, which Professor Frank M. Cross, Jr., of the Harvard Divinity School dates at the end of the third century B. C.[1]

Canon of the Old Testament

The Sadducees and the Samaritans included in the Old Testament only the first five books, the Pentateuch, whereas the Pharisees' canon or list of accepted biblical books included the Prophets and the Writings as well as the Pentateuch. The canon of Diaspora Judaism, which used the Septuagint, included in addition the Apocrypha. As more and more Old Testament books were found at Qumran, biblical scholars were interested to learn the extent of the Essenes' canon. With the exception of Esther, at least a fragment of every book in our Old Testament has been discovered in Qumran's caves. Whether the absence of Esther among the discoveries indicates that it was not in the Essene canon, or whether the copies of it are merely lost, is an open question.

The biblical books at Qumran were customarily written on leather and in columns the height of which was twice their width. Not all of the sect's copies of the book of Daniel adhere to this practice, however. This suggests that Daniel may not have been in the Essene canon; Professor Hyatt at Vanderbilt University believes that this may be the result of the recency of the composition of that book (*circa* 165 B.C.). With the possible exception of Esther and the probable exception of Daniel, the Essenes apparently accepted the full "Palestinian" canon of the Pharisees.

Was the Apocrypha in the Essene canon? The only books of the Apocrypha represented in the findings at Qumran are Tobit and Sirach. When members of the sect wrote commentaries on Old Testament books, they did so because they regarded those books as Scripture. No commentaries on any of the Apocrypha have been discovered in Qumran's caves. In spite of the fact that the Septuagint text was known to the sect, it is doubtful that the Apocrypha was used in its canon. There are, however, numerous quotations in the scrolls from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

Old Testament Text Types

The traditional view of the Old Testament text is that there are three types of it: the Masoretic, the Septuagint and the Samaritan. The Hebrew text transmitted by the Masoretes, Jewish scholars in the 6th to 10th centuries A.D., was formerly believed to be the same as that which prevailed in all of Palestine outside of Samaria. This was thought to be definitely the closest to the original text. The text of the Septuagint (the translation of the Old Testament and Apocrypha into Greek made by Alexandrian Jews from the third to the first centuries B.C.) differs from the Masoretic text in some passages. These differences or textual variants were assumed to be the product of the translators and hence necessarily later in origin and inferior to the readings in the Masoretic text. The text of the Pentateuch as it circulated among the Samaritans also contains variants from the Masoretic text, and these variants were regarded as inferior readings resulting from changes by the Samaritans.

The discoveries at Qumran have upset that traditional view of the text. There is such a variety of readings among the manuscripts from Qumran that it is apparent that the text in Palestine was not yet fixed, but was in a fluid condition. A few fragments of the Greek Septuagint were found at Qumran, containing small parts of Leviticus, Numbers and the Minor Prophets.[2] Many Hebrew

Old Testament manuscripts from Cave 4 have close affinities with the Septuagint text. Other Hebrew manuscripts are close to the Masoretic text. Others agree with some readings in the Samaritan text. The majority are "mixed" texts; i.e., at some points they agree with one type of text, at other points with another type of text.

These facts indicate that the Masoretic text is not necessarily the closest to the original. They also tell us two things about the Septuagint. Many of the distinctive readings in the Septuagint did not originate with the translators after all, but reproduce in Greek an earlier Hebrew text. Secondly, the use of the Septuagint was not confined to the Diaspora, the Jews living outside of Palestine; this Greek version was used at Qumran too, although not as much as the Hebrew texts.

The existence at Qumran of Old Testament manuscripts and readings in manuscripts which are similar to the Septuagint has convinced biblical scholars that here at Qumran is evidence of the Hebrew *Vorlage* which the translators used as their basis when they produced the Septuagint. When textual scholars speak of a *Vorlage* (German word meaning a model which is copied, etc.) of either a translation or a recension (revision) of a text, they are referring to the text upon which the translation or recension was based. Many—although not all—of the readings which are peculiar to the Septuagint did not originate with the translators; these readings are the reproduction in Greek of those in a Hebrew text, a proto-Septuagint text which was the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint. Striking evidence of this occurs in a fragment of Jeremiah from Qumran. In the Septuagint, chapter 10 of Jeremiah lacks verses 6-8 and verse 5 occurs after verse 9. This same phenomenon exists in the fragment of Jeremiah. After this discovery of a Hebrew proto-Septuagint text, textual critics can be expected to take the Septuagint text more seriously.[3]

The text which was the *Vorlage* of the Masoretic text appears at Qumran in the readings characteristic of the Masoretic text. Professor Cross refers to this text type as "the proto-Masoretic recension."[4] Furthermore, those manuscript readings at Qumran which are similar to those of the Samaritan text are regarded as evidence of the "proto-Samaritan text."

From all this it is apparent that there were several text types in use at Qumran: a proto-Masoretic text, a proto-Septuagint text, a proto-Samaritan text, and the Septuagint itself. The presence of these various text types shows that at least with the Essenes the text was not yet standardized. The Pharisees began to standardize the text around A.D. 90 at the Council of Jamnia — or possibly earlier in that century—, and Rabbi Akiba completed it early in the second century. That the text was standardized by A.D. 135 is illustrated by the scrolls found at Wady Murabbat; all of the Old Testament manuscripts found there were written in the first third of the second century A.D. and agree with the Masoretic text.

An important area of New Testament scholarship is textual criticism, the effort to learn the history of the transmission of the text and to recover as closely as possible the earliest available form of the text. The Dead Sea scrolls make it clear that the text of the Old Testament is far from settled and that the same process of trying to recover the original text—or at least the earliest form known to us—must be applied to the Old

Testament as well as to the New Testament. In both cases the text must be reconstructed by evaluating each variant; the problem cannot be solved simply by choosing an early manuscript and following it throughout. It is hoped that more Old Testament manuscripts may be found, for many of the Dead Sea manuscripts are so fragmentary that only a minority of the total of the Old Testament passages have been discovered at Qumran.

Future Translations of the Old Testament

Future reconstruction of the text of the Old Testament, as suggested by the variants and text types in the Qumran manuscripts, is almost certain to affect future translations of the Bible. St. Mark's scroll of Isaiah (1QIs[a]), one of the first biblical scrolls found at Qumran, was discovered in time to influence The Revised Standard Version's translation of Isaiah in a few passages.

Attitude Toward the Old Testament Text

In general, the Essenes transmitted the text rather faithfully, yet they felt free to alter it and make additions in various passages. This, together with the variety of text types in their Old Testament scrolls, reveals that the Essenes were far from being "fundamentalists." With them it was the teachings of Scripture, not the words and letters of it, which were regarded as sacred. In this respect their attitude toward Scripture was similar to that of the Christian monks who transmitted the Bible prior to the invention of the printing press. Professor Burrows comments: "Such exaggerated emphasis upon the exact words and even the forms of the letters as we find among the later rabbis is not in evidence at Qumran."[5]

Interpretation as a Cause of Textual Variants

As textual scholars know so well, theological motivation was a cause of variants in the text of the New Testament. The influence of this motivation upon the text has been labeled the "exegetical process" in the transmission of the text; i.e., the desire to interpret Scripture to agree with their own ideas caused scribes to change the text to fit their interpretation of it. This happened in Judaism too. Exegetical changes are found in the Septuagint, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Old Testament scrolls from Qumran. A Dead Sea scroll noted for scribal interpretations in the text is 1QIs[a].

Interpretation of the text as a cause of variants is a parallel between the Essenes and Christianity which demonstrates that human nature is essentially the same in various religions. The process of producing exegetical variants in the text was virtually stopped in Judaism after the first century by the standardization of the text. In Christianity it continued somewhat until it was ended by the advent of printing in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. When the text is not standardized, the peril is that the original readings of the text may be lost. When the text is standardized, the danger is that it may become so sacred that people almost worship it.

Support for Emendation

There are some passages in the Old Testament where the text is obscure and does not make good sense. At times scholars have suggested emending the text by changing one or more letters on the assumption that they are restoring the original reading which has been lost. Admittedly this is hazardous business, for

emendations are only reasonable guesses. The Qumran scrolls, however, support some emedations and indicate that the method is justified if used with care.

In Psalm 38:19 the Hebrew text reads, "My enemies living are mighty." The translators of the King James Authorized Version expanded it to: "But mine enemies *are* lively, *and* they are strong." The translators of the Revised Standard Version adopted a conjectural emendation and rendered it, "Those who are my foes without cause are mighty." This latter reading now has actually been found in a manuscript at Qumran.

That same manuscript supports another textual emendation which some scholars have made. In Psalm 71:6 the word which seems to mean "he who cut me" has been emended by some so that it would mean "my strength." The latter is the actual reading found in that manuscript.

This brief survey has attempted to point out some of the significance of the Old Testament scrolls from the caves at Qumran. Their effect is not so spectacular as that of some of the other scrolls from the Dead Sea. Nevertheless, these biblical manuscripts have added considerably to our knowledge of the history of the Old Testament canon and text, and they will surely contribute in the future to a better translation of some biblical passages.

NOTES

1. Pere de Vaux of the Ecole Biblique in Jerusalem originated a set of symbols to designate the Dead Sea scrolls. These symbols are now generally adopted. The initial numeral designates the cave in which the manuscript was found, and the following letter indicates the place. Thus "4Q" means the fourth cave discovered at Wady Qumran.

2. Harry M. Orlinsky, "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: the Septuagint Text," *Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVIII* (March, 1959), p. 32.

3. See J. M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1956), Chap. iv.

4. Frank M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (London: Duckworth Press, 1958), p. 125, n. 12a.

5. Millar Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: The Viking Press, 1958), p. 163.

Revivalism Among the Methodists

Kenneth M. Plummer

Much has been written about the great revival in the West beginning around 1800, the camp-meetings in Tennessee and Kentucky having been given particular attention. The effect of the revival was not confined to these states. W. W. Sweet in *The Rise of Methodism in the West* has noted that it was largely through the influence of this revival that preaching was begun north of the Ohio River in what is now Ohio and Indiana.[1] Into this territory came itinerant preachers who had been converted in the revivals in Tennessee and Kentucky and had labored on circuits there.

Little or no attention has been given, however, to the revivals during the same period in that section of the West which was included in the State of Virginia and which became the State of West Virginia in 1863. While the data are difficult to find and of a general nature, there is evidence that there was considerable revivalism in this area, particularly along the Ohio river in the section of western Virginia running north from Parkersburg and the Little Kanawha River through the panhandle to the borders of Pennsylvania. Our concern is with the Methodists in this area who were served largely from 1800-1825 by itinerant ministers whose circuits sometimes covered territory on the Ohio side of the river and in Pennsylvania but who also crossed the lines into western Virginia. Some of these men (for example, Jacob Young) had come out of the revival atmosphere of Tennessee and Kentucky. Others had been exposed to revivals and camp-meetings in Pennsylvania and Maryland. They carried on the tradition in western Virginia.

The area with which we are concerned was one of the centers of population in the newly opened West. The census of 1790 indicated that five per cent of the total population of the young nation was distributed among several pockets in the West almost lost in the wilderness. Two of these pockets numbering 55,873 were in western Virginia clustered about Wheeling and the mouth of the Kanawha River.[2] The population in the balance of western Virginia was thinly spread. As late as 1820 in the center of the territory the population was less than two inhabitants per square mile, while along the Ohio River from Parkersburg north the population ran from two to

forty-five persons per square mile with the greatest concentration in the panhandle.[3] It was in this general region that the most extensive and sustained revivalism developed.

Itinerant Methodist preachers came into this region from the Redstone Circuit. James Quinn, who itinerated in western Virginia during the first decade of the nineteenth century, says that Redstone was the name originally given "to all that country settled by the whites on the west side of the mountain." Quinn states that when he came into the country it was new and frontier and still subject to savage depredations. But it was not a moral waste for there were "laws, courts, judges and magistrates," and men were "whipped, cropped, branded and hung for stealing; and fined and imprisoned for swearing, Sabbath-breaking, etc."[4] The Methodists were already in the country when the Christmas Conference met in 1784.

John Cooper and Solomon Breeze were appointed in 1784 to the Redstone Circuit which had been pioneered in 1783 by Richard Owings. They were followed in 1785 by Peter Moriarty, J. Fidler and Wilson Lee. Cooper and Breeze worked their way west from Uniontown, Pennsylvania, the beginning of the circuit, and turned southeast from a point midway between Washington, Pennsylvania and Wellsburg in western Virginia and established societies at Crooked Creek and Morgantown in Virginia. Moriarty and his colleagues extended the circuit to embrace "that part of Virginia included in the counties of Brooke and Ohio, and extending along the Ohio from Wheeling, some twenty-five or thirty miles up to or above a place called Holliday's Cove.[5] In the spring of 1799 Robert Manley founded a circuit extending up the Little Kanawha about thirty miles.[6] Thus by 1800 Methodist work had begun around Wheeling and Short Creek, the neighborhood of Wellsburg and West Liberty, Parkersburg and the Little Kanawha.

Despite the fact that Methodists came into this section along the Ohio when settlers had just gotten established in numbers, Quinn says they found "Presbyterians, Seceders, Covenanters and Baptists" on the field. The Regular Baptists had churches in all the counties of western Virginia and were "all stiff Calvinists, close-communion men, and strongly opposed to the Methodists, as were the Presbyterians."[7]

One gets the impression that prior to 1800 revivals among Methodists in this region were non-existent, due probably to the newness of the work. Methodism got its foothold through the efforts of hard riding itinerants who faithfully made the rounds of the circuits in good weather and bad, in sickness and health, lodging with settlers who were generally poverty ridden, sleeping on rope beds or animal skins inhabited by fleas and other vermin, amidst the ever-prevalent danger of Indian hostilities. Revivalism apparently began in earnest among the Methodists around 1805, and by 1810 camp meetings were being held one or more times annually on most circuits.

Revival meetings involving large numbers of persons were not unknown in western Virginia. The eastern section of the future State of West Virginia had been touched by the first great awakening among the Methodists in America which began in the parish of Devereux Jarrett, an Anglican clergyman who cooperated with the Methodists, in 1765 at Bath in

Dinwiddie County. This revival which spread to fourteen counties soon involved the Methodists. Thomas Rankin notes, for example, the effect of the revival at Boisseau's Chapel near Petersburg.[8] Frequently, the summer quarterly meeting was the occasion of a short revival lasting several days. In his Journal for August, 1789 Asbury notes:

> *Saturday,* 29. Our quarterly meeting began in the woods near Sheperdstown; we had about seven hundred people . . . . *Sunday,* 30. Was a high day — one thousand or fifteen hundred people attended; sinners began to mock, and many cried aloud, and so it went.[9]

The same type of quarterly meeting developed along the Ohio in western Virginia. Quarterly meetings were generally held in private homes and in meeting houses, both of which were too small to accommodate the crowds which assembled. The meetings were moved outside when the weather permitted. "So, soon after their origin on the western frontier, the Methodist Summer Quarterly Meetings were held, not for the usual two days, but for five or six days, and were held as Camp-meetings."[10] Materials available indicate that this development took place after 1800 in the region along the Ohio with which we are primarily concerned.[11] The first camp-meeting in this area recorded by Asbury was in August, 1805. His Journal contains this brief account:

> *Monday,* 19. The camp meeting begins tomorrow at Short Creek near the Great River!
> *Sunday,* 25. I preached at the camp ground: it was a moving time. On Monday I preached again. It was judged there were five thousand souls present to hear; and that one hundred souls were converted to God.[12]

This camp-meeting, several miles north of Wheeling, was the first to be held on the original Ohio Circuit formed in 1787 from the old Redstone Circuit. This was the predecessor of the Castleman's Run Camp-meeting near West Liberty to which it was moved in 1815.[13] The camp at Castleman's Run was still functioning in 1870.[14]

In the spring of 1805 a camp-meeting had been held farther south along the Ohio. Jacob Young had been appointed to the Marietta Circuit with its center at Marietta, Ohio and with preaching places in western Virginia. There in the spring of 1805, Young says, "we held a protracted meeting on the banks of the Little Kanawha just below Parkersburg. Having cleared the ground with our own hands, built a pulpit and made seats, we commenced operations on Friday and held it till Wednesday. The meeting resulted in great good. Almost everybody able to travel attended meeting night and day."[15] Young's account of the meeting is typical of the reports of camp-meetings given by most of the early evangelists. He says nothing about the number of persons attending, converts made, or how many were added to the societies as a result of the meeting. The results could not have been too auspicious, however, since he says that this year was "on the whole, the most barren I had ever experienced in the ministry."[16]

Young notes that in 1808 he was appointed to the West Wheeling Circuit. His presiding elder was James Quinn. Quinn, says Young, lived and preached like a "primitive evangelist," and "we soon had revival meetings at nearly all our preaching places."[17] One such meeting was held in conjunction with the fourth quarterly meeting in 1808 at the house of John Spahr, Sr., a patriarch of Methodism who lived near Short Creek and where, according to Young, many camp

meetings were held. Several preachers were present including Quinn and John Holmes under whose preaching people fell "like men slain in battle."[18]

Young was appointed to the Ohio Circuit of the Baltimore Conference in 1810, including the panhandle of western Virginia. Again he reports a camp-meeting at Short Creek at the second quarterly meeting. His account of the meeting reveals the difficult circumstances under which such revival efforts were conducted in the context of the brawling frontier, circumstances which often prompted preachers to take precipitate action.

> Great preparations were made for this meeting. We had a great deal of ministerial help and our elder exerted himself to the very utmost of his ability. There was good done, but it was not equal to the meeting held the year before on the West Wheeling circuit. The rowdies annoyed us exceedingly. They pitched their tents on the hillsides round about and sold whisky, brandy and cider. I visited and conversed with them till I found I could accomplish nothing in that way. I then took a strong man with me and a hammer, went to their tents, knocked in the heads of their casks, and spilled their liquor on the ground. We had a delightful time at the close of the meeting; a good many joined the church.[19]

James Quinn notes in his memoirs a camp-meeting on the Little Kanawha during his tenure as presiding elder of the Muskingum District. It was here "in the month of September, 1810 that we pitched our tents on the lands of Richard Lee two miles above Parkersburg on the Little Kanawha."[20] Asbury and his travelling companion the Reverend H. Boehm attended and stayed at the home of Richard Lee, the house of his old friend Wilson Lee. Asbury, says Quinn, "preached twice during the meeting with great light, life and power. Surely the Lord helped him, and good, great good, was done."[21] He further notes that Asbury was highly pleased with the arrangement and good order which prevailed.

Asbury notes this meeting in his Journal for September, 1810:

> *Saturday.* I hear of a camp meeting at Little Kanawha, and must needs go there. After toiling through bad roads and accidents at the ferry to detain us, we are here this Saturday night at nine o'clock, safe at the home of the brother of Wilson Lee. Lord, prepare me by thy grace for the patient endurance of hunger, heat, labour, the clownishness of ignorant piety, the impudence of the impious, unreasonable preachers, and more unreasonable heretics and heresy.
> *Sunday,* 9. I preached at the camp twice. Souls were converted and we hope much good was done.[22]

Whether Asbury expected to encounter the impudent preachers and heretics at the camp meeting, he does not say.

Methodists utilized the technique of the camp-meeting with increasing tempo during the latter years of the first decade of the nineteen century. Asbury exults in the prevalence of camp-meetings during this period. In a letter to Elijah Hedding dated December 14, 1807 he states that he had "either seen, or heard, directly or indirectly, from most of the thirty-five districts . . . . From what I have collected, camp-meetings are common now as quarter meetings were twenty years back; in many districts happy hundreds have been converted; in others happy thousands. Glory! Glory! Glory!"[23] West Virginia being frontier territory was natural ground for the use of this technique, and it shared in the increased utilization of this means of reaching people in large numbers. James Quinn notes that during his tenure as presiding elder in this region, 1809-1812, he annually presided at more than twelve camp-meetings per year, one in each charge and frequently two.

The available information suggests that the two principle centers of camp-meetings in western Virginia up to 1810 were at the Little Kanawha near Parkersburg and at Short Creek near Wheeling. Material covering specific meetings from 1810-1820 is scarce. Apparently the meetings at Parkersburg and Little Kanawha continued. The Minutes of the Annual Conferences for 1870 contain a biographical sketch of the life of Reverend Philip Green which states that he was converted at a camp meeting near Parkersburg on July 16, 1813.[24] Asbury's Journal for August 13, 1815 mentions a report given him by David Young that at a recent meeting at the Kanawha camp twenty-five were converted.[25] We have previously noted that the camp at Short Creek was moved to Castleman's Run in 1815 where it became a center of revivalism not only for the panhandle but for the neighboring states of Ohio and Pennsylvania as well. George Brown, a native of Brooke County in western Virginia, was appointed in the fall of 1820 to the Washington Station, Pennsylvania. He reports that during that year the camp-meeting at Castleman's Run was largely attended by people from Washington.[26]

The following year Brown was appointed to Wheeling and Short Creek, nine miles apart. During this year, 1821, he states that the meeting at Castleman's Run was one of considerable size, and "we gained many converts and additions to the church," about one hundred sixty for the year.[27] In 1823-1824 Brown was presiding elder of the Monongahela District which encompassed most of the panhandle. He states that while he was on the district there were revivals and large additions to the church each year. "My district was famous for its camp-meetings. The lowest we held in one camp-meeting season was eight; the highest, eleven. The meetings as a general thing were largely attended and were real working meetings; not meetings of feasting, parade and show. God owned them by the advancement of his children in scriptural holiness, and in the conversion of sinners in great numbers from the error of their ways. Reverend William Barnes of the Wheeling Station got leave of absence from his charge and accompanied me as a fellow laborer to the eleven meetings in one season, and rendered very important service."[28]

Brown's account, written in 1866, is especially interesting in terms of his statement that the meetings were real working meetings, not meetings of feasting, parade and show. By the turn of the middle years of the century camp-meetings had changed over from being an evangelizing agency by which the church was built up to become a summertime religious emphasis for the spiritual up-building of believers. The camp-meeting became a "religious-social gathering" attended by the church members chiefly rather than by the unconverted people of the countryside.[29]

Camp-meetings among the Methodists were generally orderly affairs. While accounts of such meetings note that people under conviction "fell like men slain in battle," excessive emotionalism and bizarre manifestations were discouraged. James B. Finley, noted frontier Methodist evangelist, states that Methodists considered such "disgusting" and "strange exercises" as dancing, laughing, barking like dogs or howling like wolves, jerking, rolling on the ground as "the chaff of the work."[30] James Quinn notes that Methodist camps were well directed and protec-

ted. Ground rules were laid governing the time of arising in the morning and retiring in the evening, family prayers, preaching services, the eating of meals. All events were heralded by the sound of a trumpet. Great care was exercised to exclude rowdies and ruffians from the camp ground, especially when the time for retirement came after the evening meeting. The length of the camp-meeting was determined in part by so simple a concern as the amount of food which could be prepared beforehand and consumed at the campground before it spoiled, since generally no cooking was allowed during the meeting. Prayer meetings and preaching continued throughout the day and sometimes far into the night. Preaching took place alternately at one or two stands erected some twenty or thirty rods apart. "Each public service was followed by a prayer meeting, which was not to be broken off to make way for preaching, but the trumpet was sounded at the other stand, whither all who wished to hear preaching were wont to repair. Here, also, a prayer meeting ensued, and so alternately through the day. There were no altars, no mourner's benches, or anxious seats, in those days, nor were any invitations given to seekers of salvation to present themselves for the prayers of the Church, but soon after the commencement of the prayer meeting, praying and singing groups and circles were seen and heard throughout the encampment, even to the outskirts of the congregation; and there was no great difficulty in keeping pretty good order, for an awful sense of the majesty and glory of God often appeared to pervade the whole assembly."[31]

Not all the difficulty which the director of a camp-meeting encountered was caused by the rowdies, but by his over-zealous brethren. Brown suggests that great labor and care was needed not only "to see that order was maintained so as to prevent the outside world from doing harm to the worshippers," but also "to give right direction to all the ministerial talent on hand, so as to keep down the little petty jealousies too often found among preachers on such occasions, and to employ the whole force at hand, both ministerial and lay, so as to bring as many souls as possible to Christ."[32]

One has to infer from remarks dropped occasionally by the itinerant as to the content of the preaching at camp-meetings. Sermons were evidently designed to convict sinners. Of one of Asbury's sermons Quinn says, "At three o'clock the Bishop preached a plain and powerful sermon . . . . O, what awful appeals to the understanding and to the heart! There was no daubing with untempered mortar."[33] Bishop Morris gives an account of one of Quinn's sermons delivered at a camp-meeting in western Virginia during the summer of 1812. The sermon was based on the story of Dives and Lazarus. It portrayed in graphic terms the sufferings of Lazarus as compared to the riches of Dives, the bliss of Lazarus in heaven as compared to the awful sufferings of Dives in hell, accompanied by alternating expressions of anguish and delight on the part of the preacher. So vivid was the portrayal, says Morris, that "cold chills ran all over us, the hair seemed to rise on our heads, while groans of pity and shrieks of horror commingled around us, like the startling tones of sweeping tempest, attended with a shock of Divine power as sensibly felt as if it had been the tread of an earthquake."[34] The contrast between the final

end of the saint and sinner fixed a powerful impression.

Itinerants who travelled in western Virginia indicate that what little study they were able to undertake was limited to the Bible, Wesley's sermons, and the works of Fletcher. Finley's sketch of the life of Reverend Michael Ellis who travelled the West Wheeling Circuit in 1810 suggests that Ellis never preached a sermon "in which he did not introduce the doctrine of Christian perfection as taught in the Bible and preached by Wesley and Fletcher."[35] His favourite themes were justification, santification and eternal redemption which "he compared to a ladder, the foot of which rested on earth, and the top of which entered heaven; justification, sanctification and redemption were three successive rounds of this ladder, over which the soul passes in its course to heaven."[36] One concludes that frontier preachers were expounding the Wesleyan doctrines of free-will, new birth, justification, sanctification, assurance, Christian perfection, and apparently sharpening these against the Calvinism which they encountered.

Methodist versus Calvinist doctrine must have been an issue in camp-meeting preaching. Quinn indicated in 1851 that "some of the third and fourth generation descendents of early Presbyterians" along the Ohio are now "warm-hearted members of the Methodist Episcopal Church."[37] George Brown notes that the camp-meeting at Castleman's Run reached many who were "Calvinistically educated: and belonged to Presbyterian and Baptist churches."[38] Perhaps the prevailing mood of the time is indicated by James B. Finley who served as presiding elder in the panhandle of western Virginia in 1816. He states that the Methodists were a minority group, as compared to the Presbyterians, and "Presbyterian dignity could not stoop to a recognition of them." However, when the Methodist preacher would awaken a town, the Presbyterian minister would take note of the increased interest in religion and suggest a union meeting. Finley strongly advised against such union meetings. "I plainly told my brethren I had nothing against the Presbyterians; I loved them, but I loved Methodism more, and, as we had a shop of our own, we would not journeywork any longer."[39] Finley says he told the Presbyterians, "In your union meetings you cannot pray aloud; and if one of you should get happy, you must quench the spirit; or if you take a Methodist shout, they will carry you out as a disturber of the peace; besides you dare not even to say amen above a whisper."[40] Finley carried with him the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Saybrook Platform and exposed for his hearers "the doctrine of the horrible decree."[41] He urged his preachers to scatter such doctrinal tracts as Wesley on Predestination and Fletcher's Checks. With the issue between Methodists and Calvinists so alive, the doctrines in controversy must certainly have found their way into camp-meeting preaching.

What the precise results of the revivalism in western Virginia were in terms of numbers of persons converted and taken into Methodist societies from 1800-1825 is impossible to determine on the basis of the data available. W. G. Smeltzer's study *Methodism on the Headwaters of the Ohio* points out that the Methodists west of the mountains moved from fifteen circuits, manned by twenty circuit riders, and numbering 4,363 members in 1800 to five annual conferences in the

West, counting 114,593 members, or thirty-five per cent of the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in 1824.[42] Statistics for individual preaching places were not published in the annual conference journals. During the twenty-five year period district and circuit boundaries changed so much that it is difficult to un-scramble membership statistics for the circuits. Two circuits which served western Virginia and show relative stability during the period, with the emphasis on relative, were the Little Kanawha and the West Wheeling. The Little Kanawha showed a membership in 1800 of six hundred thirty-one whites and ten colored. By 1825 the circuit had grown to six hundred thirty-one whites and seventeen colored. West Wheeling, which at times took in the region around West Wheeling and Short Creek, first appeared in the Minutes for 1802 with a membership of two hundred sixty-five whites and one colored. In 1825 it reported a membership of eight hundred whites.[43]

At this juncture we can only conclude, pending further study, that from 1800-1825 Methodists along the Ohio in western Virginia participated largely in the revivalism of the period with major activity occurring around Parkersburg on the Little Kanawha, at Short Creek near Wheeling, and at Castleman's Run near West Liberty. Revivalism constituted a considerable factor in helping Methodism to gain a solid foothold in the midst of what had been in 1800 virtually pioneer Methodist territory.

NOTES

1. W. W. Sweet, *The Rise of Methodism in the* West (New York and Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1920), p. 21.
2. W. W. Sweet, *Circuit Rider Days Along the Ohio* (New York and Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1923), p. 20.
3. See map in *ibid.*, p. 26.
4. John F. Wright, *Sketches of the Life and Labors of James Quinn* (Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1851), p. 31.
5. *ibid.*, p. 43.
6. Thomas S. Hinde (Theophilus Arminius) "Rise and Progress of Religion in Ohio, Northwestern Pennsylvania and Western Part of Virginia," *The Methodist Magazine,* V (1822), p. 391.
7. Wright, *op. cit.*
8. For an account of the revival in Virginia see *The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury,* E. T. Clark, Editor-in-Chief. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, London: Epworth Press, 1958), pp. 207-223.
9. *ibid.*, p. 607.
10. W. G. Smeltzer, *Methodism on the Headwaters of the Ohio* (Nashville: The Parthenon Press, 1951), p. 105.
11. This article is being written under the difficulty of a lack of orginial source material which gives specific information. General, annual and quarterly conference minutes took no note of camp meetings. We are dependent chiefly upon autobiographies and biographies of early itinerant ministers which are singularly lacking in specific information, especially data concerning the results of camp-meetings.
12. Asbury's *Journal,* II, p. 478.
13. See footnote in *ibid.*
14. Smeltzer, *op. cit.*, page 224 contains a list of camp-meetings held in western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio and West Virginia in 1870, taken from the *Pittsburgh Christian Advocate* for July 16, 1870.

15. Jacob Young, *Autobiography of a Pioneer* (Cincinnati: L. Swormstedt and A. Poe, 1857), pp. 157-158.

16. *ibid.*, pp. 160.

17. *ibid.*, p. 260.

18. *ibid.*, p. 264.

19. *ibid.*, pp. 269-270.

20. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 101; quoted from the memoirs of James Quinn.

21. *ibid.*, p. 102.

22. Asbury's *Journal*, II, p. 648.

23. *ibid.*, III, pp. 380-381.

24. G. C. Wilding, *Promoted Pioneer Preachers of the West Virginia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church*. Excerpts from the Annual Conference minutes compiled by the Annual Conference Commission on Methodist History, p. 19.

25. Asbury's *Journal*, II, p. 788.

26. Reverend George Brown, *Recollections of Itinerant Life* (Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll and Co., Publishers, 1866), p. 97.

27. *ibid.*, p. 102.

28. *ibid.*, p. 122.

29. Smeltzer, *op. cit.*, p. 223ff.

30. *Autobiography of Reverend James B. Finley* (Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe, 1853), p. 372.

31. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

32. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

33. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 102; quoted from the memoirs of James Quinn.

34. *ibid.*, p. 112; quoted from the writings of Bishop Morris.

35. James B. Finley, *Sketches of Western Methodism* (Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1854), p. 98.

36. *ibid.*

37. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 32; quoted from the memoirs of James Quinn.

38. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

39. *Autobiography of James B. Finley*, p. 288.

40. *ibid.* The Presbyterians in this area were evidently of that school which held to strict Calvinist orthodoxy, and while they did not oppose revivals they favored a particular kind of revivalism, the kind of unemotional, controlled revivalism practised among Presbyterians and Congregationalists in New England. See W. W. Sweet, *Revivalism in America* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944) for a discussion of the various types of revivalism.

41. *ibid.*

42. Smeltzer, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

43. *Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church* for the Years 1773-1828, I (New York: T. Mann and G. Lane, 1840), pp. 92, 103, 449, 451.

Does Religion Elude Scientific Nets?*

Paul E. Johnson

This society is devoted to the scientific study of religion. The steady growth in its membership and the crescendo of research brought to its meetings indicate a sturdy hope that religion may be reduced to scientific terms. The advancing frontiers of human knowledge give witness to the scientific conquest of one territory after another. And religion has been under attack from many sectors by invading forces who carry the flag of science.

If we are assuming that religion can be scientific let us pause long enough to examine this basic presupposition. Do we really mean to say that whatever is can be measured with nothing left over beyond the arbitrary counters and quanta of our science? It does appear that many aspects of religious behavior have been subjected to such measurement. The frequency of church attendance has been noted as well as the behavior of persons in church services of worship. Questionnaire studies have shown the average age of conversion for a sample of population. Opinion surveys have been widely used to report the statistics of various religious beliefs.

But such measures are too peripheral and superficial to capture the whole meaning of religious experience. The more external traits are, the more likely they are to be observed and offered as scientific data. Such traits may be treated statistically and by the force of numbers held forth as the essential and common elements of religion. This leads into the fallacy of abstraction in which the unique individuality and concrete relatedness of experience escapes these artificial units.

Another error in scientific treatment of religion is the reductive fallacy. No less a genius than Sigmund Freud fell into this fallacy when he observed "a remarkable similarity between obsessive acts and religious practices or ritual." He confessed later that "without understanding the deeper connections, I described the obsessional neurosis as a distorted private religion and religion as a kind of universal obsessional neurosis."[1] Proceeding by superficial analogy he continued to assume that all religion may be captured in one symptom and reduced to a single phrase like "obsessional neurosis."

In our session this afternoon we have heard from scientists who are fully aware of these dangers in hasty generalization. They agree that many so-called scientific studies have fallen into fallacies of ab-

---

*This paper was originally presented before the Nineteenth Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Yale University, Oct. 30-31, 1959.

straction and reduction. What they are seeking is to find more adequate measures and sophisticated concepts of religion. They have come far indeed from persons described by William James as those "who seem to think that any conclusion must be very scientific if arguments in favor of it are all derived from twitchings of frogs' legs, especially if the frogs were decapitated."[2]

Mr. Fukuyama[3] and Mr. Harrison[4] are concerned with the function which religion may have in life as a whole. They do not assume that words hold the same meaning for different persons; but well perceive that each person uses his beliefs in a unique way. Beliefs may be active and relevant for one person which to another person are passive and residual. The functions of a belief may be teleological, identifying or coordinating.

Mr. Douglas[5] and Mr. DeBoer[6] are seeking depth measures and participant observations that will be more adaptive to the complexities and organismic wholeness of religious experiences. Douglas seeks to gather the personal meaning of a religious life by inventing new sentence completion and thematic tests to call forth the unique character of individual experience. DeBoer is asking if the relationship of love can be measured by interpersonal participation.

These are promising steps toward scientific measures which may tap deeper levels of religious meaning. They predict an advancing frontier of scientific instruments and procedures which will yield richer evidence to comprehend religious mysteries. We must surely commend every forward step through scientific ingenuities that will bring to light a more valid comprehension of religion.

Yet the question I must raise is how far will scientific measures take us when all these ingenuities have done their best. Are we in principle, and not by temporary technical inabilities, prevented from measuring the full and essential subtleties of religious devotion? Let me freely confess that I cannot see very far ahead, or begin to anticipate the flood of new methods which will stream forth by the cooperative and tireless labor of devoted scientists. It is from the humility of a very finite incompleteness that I speak, with no pretension of omniscience. But from my limited viewpoint I must sound a note of grave caution. I have serious doubt that scientific method will ever capture the ultimate religious concern.

Why do I so grimly perceive the limitations of science? First, because science measures quantities, while the essential quality of a religious life is more than serial numbers. Eddington, for example, insists that the mathematical constructs of physics have about as much relation to nature as a telephone number has to a subscriber.[7] This may also be said of scientific studies of religion.

Second, all theory is abstract and partial, manifesting in convenient formulation only that aspect of a concrete whole which serves to simplify the boundless mystery. Religious seeking has insisted on crossing every boundary and pressing beyond our neat and simplified theories. The work of scientific analysis isolates and factors out elements, but the religious search is for relationship to heal the conflict and fulfill the hunger for wholeness which is our insatiable longing.

Third, you will be waiting to reply that science does seek relations between a subject and the objects of his investi-

gating interest. But this is not the religious encounter with the ultimate Thou. The movement of science is toward the object as impersonal; which is the I-it relation, as Buber would say. The religious quest is the encounter of person with Person, which is the I-Thou relationship. In the I-Thou relation there is heightened intensity of awareness which seeks the answering response to open the course of creative life.[8]

But you ask, what if the scientist is a religious person who undertakes his scientific work with religious devotion, will he not come nearer to the holy of holies? This will depend upon his ultimate concern. If his primary allegiance is to the cognitive work of science then his religious devotion will not be authentic but only a clever and deceptive means to another nonreligious goal. However, if his ultimate concern is the existential encounter in this living moment with the eternal Thou, he seeks to transcend the limitations of science. Then he will not reduce the existential encounter to scientific abstractions, for he will offer himself to the greatness and the glory of the eternal Thou. His scientific discipline may serve as the handmaid of his theology to record in part and if possible to communicate some glimpse of the *mysterium tremendum* that he meets in the living encounter.[9]

NOTES

1. Sigmund Freud, "Obsessive Acts and Religious Practices," *Collected Papers* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1924), pp. 25-35.
2. William James, The Lowell Lectures in 1878. Quoted by R. B. Perry, *Thought and Character of William James* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1935), p. 30.
3. Yoshio Fukuyama, "Using Belief to Define Differential Religious Orientation." Unpublished paper read at the Nineteenth Meeting of The Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Yale University, October 30-31, 1959.
4. P. Harrison, "Problems in Studying Belief Systems." Unpublished paper read at the Nineteenth Meeting of The Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Yale University, October 30-31, 1959.
5. W. Douglas, " 'Depth' Measures of Religious Variables." Unpublished paper read at the Nineteenth Meeting of The Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Yale University, October 30-31, 1959.
6. L. DeBoer, "Participant Observation." Unpublished paper read at the Nineteenth Meeting of The Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Yale University, October 30-31, 1959.
7. J. Magee, *Reality and Prayer* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957).
8. R. May, "The Nature of Creativity," *A Review of General Semantics,* 1959, 16, pp. 261-276.
9. R. Otto, *Das Heilige* (Translated as *The Idea of the Holy* by J. W. Harvey). (London: Oxford University Press, 1923).

BOOK REVIEWS

Music in the Life of Albert Schweitzer. By Charles R. Joy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959. 300 pp. $1.75.

The author compiles a sort of biographical account of music in the life of Albert Schweitzer through a chronological, but somewhat disjointed, selection of his writings on various musical topics. Intercalated between the writings Joy makes excursions into certain facets of the man's history, his struggles, aspirations and attitudes.

The first portion of the book sets forth many of the influences and experiences in Schweitzer's early career, including close relationships with his teachers, geographical locations and church centers, organizations, and recollections of famous persons of the post-Wagnerian era. Chapter IV, entitled: Bach: the Musician-Poet, might well be considered the high point of interest to the average reader. Translated from the original French, it is good reading, dealing primarily with the symbolism in Bach's music. Written in the early period of Schweitzer's career, it presents a revealing analysis of significant, but generally hidden meanings in Bach's musical works. Here Schweitzer attempts to penetrate the true inner meaning of the composer's music, the mystical substance, the character of the man and his fundamentally religious conception of his art. In this respect Schweitzer perhaps achieves—with intuitive and scholarly acumen—what other Bach scholars have suspected but dared not expound upon at the risk of associating Bach with anything beyond the Appollonian concept of purism. Schweitzer points up the descriptive and programistic element. Bach is portrayed in a milieu of early eighteenth century religious philosophy, in the midst of the struggles between Lutheran Orthodoxy and Pietism, with their concomitantly diverse attitudes toward art and music. Bach embraces a "dual religious attitude" which converges into a transcending element of mysticism, the "living spring from which sprang his piety." Here Schweitzer presents a revealing facet of Bach's religious awareness, and how this functions in his musical expression as a unifying thread between music and text. This, however, is only a single exposure of the overall palette of his compositional technic and musical personality, of which Schweitzer is thoroughly apprised; there is danger in placing undue significance on this aspect at the expense of the man's total genius.

An extensive section of the book is devoted to Schweitzer's writings on the subject of organs and organ building. Technically enlightening as these discussions may be to one whose interests lie in this area, this appears to be maladroitly disproportionate to the rest of the book; it will not be easy reading for many.

Throughout the book are sporadic and brief references to Schweitzer's pursuits in theology, medicine and philosophy, but there is no attempt here—and perhaps appropriately so—to affix any correlation between his music and his religious philosophy. To both the religious practitioner and the layman as well much of the book should prove valuable reading, including biographical anecdotes on Schweitzer, his sojourns and his efforts on behalf of the hospital at Lamberine, Africa, and disclosures of his thoughts and attitudes on a variety of subjects. There are some inaccuracies in geography, and the scholar may read, with tongue in cheek, certain of Joy's subjective impressions of both Bach and Schweitzer. To the musician, and more especially the church musician, these selected writings, hitherto unpublished in English, should prove of specific interest and practical value.

C. BUELL AGEY
Chairman, Department of Music
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Buckhannon, West Virginia

The Old Testament as Word of God. By Sigmund Mowinckel. New York; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. 144 pages. $2.75.

Beginning with the Renaissance in the fifteenth century and the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century, Christianity in the West has been rediscovering facts about the ancient world which have changed the traditional understanding of the Bible. From the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries the "new" knowledge consisted largely of

lexicography (knowledge of the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek words in which the Bible was written) and textual criticism (study of the variant readings in the New Testament manuscripts). In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries knowledge of the historical environment in which the Bible was written has made tremendous contributions.

Christianity has been reluctant to accept and adjust to this knowledge, but today there is an increasing conviction that this knowledge can not and should not be ignored. Still unsolved, however, is the problem of the effect of this information upon the role of the Bible in Christian faith today. Judaism has a similar problem with the Old Testament. It is in the light of that problem that Professor Mowinckel's book should be read, for his book is one among many Christian efforts to deal with that question.

This book was originally published in the Norwegian language in 1938, and now has been republished in English translation.

Professor Mowinckel was a member of the theological faculty at the University of Oslo, Norway, from 1915 until his retirement in 1954. He is internationally recognized as a prominent Old Testament scholar. His most outstanding books are his famous *Psalmenstudien (Studies of the Psalms)* and his *He That Cometh,* a survey of Jewish expectations of the coming Christ or Messiah.

In the book, *The Old Testament as Word of God,* Professor Mowinckel begins by affirming his agreement with the traditional Christian view that the Old Testament *is* the word of God. But in what sense is this true? He rejects the view, once held by Lutheran theologians, that the Old Testament is "verbally inspired" and hence is "infallible."

The author observes that the Old Testament is a human book. "One cannot close one's eyes to the fact that the Old Testament contains many statements of historical, geographical, chronological, and biological nature, and so on, that simply cannot be harmonized with the present stage of our knowledge, statements which, therefore, to that extent are *erroneous*" (p. 13). This is because the Old Testament *"is related to the culture, mentality, morality, and knowledge of a specific time"* (p. 14) and because the prophets, who were the source of much of the content, had "strong *individual differences*" (p. 18).

Then Mowinckel states the problem: "How then can the Old Testament be divine revelation and at the same time a very human book, . . . ?" (p. 20).

In working out a solution to the problem our author starts with the presupposition that there is such a thing as "revelation of God." The human element in the Old Testament does not conflict with the belief that it contains the revelation of God, unless one believes in verbal inspiration of the Bible, a doctrine which is "not in the Bible" (p. 23).

What is the revelation of God? Mowinckel's answer: "it is God's work in history that is his most authentic and direct revelation" (p. 40). This concept of revelation necessitates a theological philosophy of history in which one finds "a supramundane meaning in history," in contrast to "intramundane" views of history.

If God's revelation is mainly through history, then how is the Old Testament divine revelation? Professor Mowinckel's answer is based on traditional doctrine: God chose Israel so that he could lead history to its goal, Christ. Thus "Christ is the center of revelation" (p. 47). The Old Testament is revelation in that it reveals the Jewish phase of that process.

The revelation through the Bible, both Old Testament and New Testament, is not perfect, however, for it is revelation received and reported by man. "But even the revelation in Christ does not give perfection all at once in a complete realization of God. That is why Christ at his departure said to his disciples that . . . he would send them the Spirit of Truth, who would guide them to all truth. . . ." (p. 83).

The author recognizes that there has been some revelation in other religions too. This is because God has created and guided *all* history, and therefore he reveals through *all* history.

One may well question the logic of a few of Mowinckel's contentions. Is myth really necessary in religion, as he contends? Does the fact that there has been only *"one"* Jesus of Nazareth really signify that God has broken into history? Is the formation of the Old Testament canon really a part of history guided by God, so that the canon itself is

revelation? The author believes that the Apocrypha *should be* in the canon; is this not contrary to his contention that God has controlled the history of the canon? Is the belief that Christ is the center of revelation consistent with the modern belief in continuing and developing revelation?

In spite of these weak spots, *The Old Testament as Word of God* is a stimulating work. Ministers and directors of religious education who wish to lead laymen in an exodus from bondage to fundamentalism, out toward the promised land of enlightenment, may find this small book a useful tool. The Old Testament is the best area in which to begin historical study of the Bible, and this book could serve as a stimulus in adult study groups.

HOWARD M. TEEPLE
Associate Professor of Religion
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Buckhannon, West Virginia

The Riddle of Roman Catholicism. By Jaroslav Pelikan. New York: Abingdon Press, 1959. 272 pages. $4.00.

The author of *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism,* winner of the Abingdon Award for 1959, is professor of historical theology in the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago. He is recognized widely as an authoritative interpreter of the Protestant Reformation and of Martin Luther, is one of the editors of the latest series of Luther's works, religion editor for the Encyclopedia Britannica, and co-author of the movie "Martin Luther."

Dr. Pelikan places his study against the background of the general dearth of understanding of Roman Catholicism which is typical of most Protestants. This lack of understanding makes of Roman Catholicism "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma," to use Winston Churchill's trenchant phrase, and it is at the root of much of the resentment, suspicion and fear directed at the Roman Church. The author wishes to remove the mystery by supplying "information and interpretation" which is both "sympathetic and critical," and "unabashedly theological" in its approach. He is eminently successful. At the same time he makes Protestants aware of facets of their faith which they often overlook. He believes such awareness is the first step in the direction of attempts to remove the scandal of a divided Christendom.

The study proceeds on the premise that the Protestant image of Roman Catholicism which is based in the stereotypes of the Reformation is in need of correction. Roman Catholicism has both improved, in some respects, and deteriorated in others since the sixteenth century. The author's summary treatment of the Roman Church in the modern world is invaluable for an understanding of the broad changes which have taken place since the Reformation against the background of an analysis of the origin and evolution of Roman Catholicism. This analysis, though necessarily brief and not concerned with historical detail, provides an excellent introduction to the process by which primitive Christianity became Catholic Christianity and then Roman Catholic in terms of organization, church life and theology.

Dr. Pelikan shows rare insight and fairness on the part of a Protestant in his treatment of the inner life and particular doctrines of Roman Catholicism. This is must reading for those who wish to appraise sympathetically and fairly those aspects of Roman doctrine and cultus which Protestants have long considered as mere superstitious nonsense or as having no biblical warrant. We refer, for example, to the doctrine of the church based on Matthew 16:18-19, the cult of the Blessed Virgin, the sacramental system, the concept of the relationship between church and state. The author's discussion of the weaknesses and strengths of the Roman position goes far in the direction of clarifying many fuzzy and ill-formed Protestant criticisms. Of equal value is his analysis of the weakness and perils of the Protestant alternative to many of the Roman Catholic doctrines.

The discussion of the basic unity which Protestants and Roman Catholics already have and the great theological questions which are still at issue between them and stand as barriers to the unity we seek is well worth the price of the book. One who hopes that eventually a start can be made toward healing the body of Christ will find hopeful signs that at least on some issues, on both sides of the fence, the gulf which has separated the two great Christian bodies is beginning to narrow. One notes that in the area of biblical studies Roman Catholic interpreters have moved in

the direction of accepting the historical-critical approach to the study of the Old Testament, so that some Protestants sense a greater affinity with such Roman Catholics than they do with other Protestants who still reject the historical-critical study of biblical materials. On the other hand, Protestants have been reappraising their concept of the place of Church tradition in shaping the forms of the New Testment. While Roman Catholics have been learning to appreciate the values of the Protestant emphasis on hymn singing and preaching in the service of worship, Protestants have been showing an increasing interest in liturgical worship. These illustrations of the changes that have been taking place do not lead the author to jump at once to the conclusion that the modifications of posture on both sides will lead to the unification of Roman Catholics and Protestants in any forseeable future. The differences which separate them are too deep and honest. He does suggest, however, that the time is propitious for Protestants and Roman Catholics, while maintaining their own distinctive witness, to find increasing opportunity for face to face, candid confrontation and discussion of the theological, social and political grounds on which they differ, in the context of an honest recognition that each has a valid contribution to make to the dialogue.

The author's approach is neither argumentative nor one-sidedly Protestant. His approach to Roman Catholicism is based on sound scholarship, and is the work of a man who is a Protestant, and knows why he is a Protestant, but who can assess with fairness and empathy the validity and vitality of the Roman tradition.

KENNETH M. PLUMMER
Associate Professor of Religion and
Director of the Library of Religion
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Buckhannon, West Virginia

Politics and Evangelism. By Philippe Maury. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1959. 120 pages. $2.95.

Many books are designed to speak to our present age in the light of Christian thought, but few succeed as well as this one. To take such subjects as politics and evangelism and combine them in one work is a delicate task and yet, Mr. Philippe Maury has accomplished this well. The old cry of so many Christians, "Religion and politics just do not mix," is out of date for one who examines Mr. Maury's credentials and then reads the book keeping them in mind. Speaking from his experience as a member of the French Underground during World War II, and then later as a member of a French Cabinet, Mr. Maury clearly sets forth the truth that the primary purpose of the Church is evangelism, and that any church not engaged in evangelism is not doing a job.

Two groups, however, seem to dominate the religious scene. There are the "pietists" who take the attitude that politics in any form is not in keeping with the Christian ethic, and therefore they take a *laissez faire* attitude toward anything political. In the assumption that the Christian must be forever separated from "the things of the world," the pietists fail to see that by engaging in politics in a creative way they can also engage in evangelism. The other group, the "catholics" (not only Roman), tends to absorb the world into the Church. "In its attempt to Christianize the world, the Church only secularizes itself." These two extremes are a concern to the author and he reminds the reader that both should be avoided and that a middle-of-the-road policy of eschatological and historical concern should be adopted by the Church.

A series of cautions throughout the book make it a stimulating guidebook for the professional Christian — be he occupationally employed in the work of the Church, or a layman employed by conviction in the life of the Church. The many political fronts of the world seem to move a little closer as one considers his Christian responsibility to others. When the reader sees what has been going on in these world frontiers, he knows that the ecumenical unity which is sought by so many, can never be achieved until personal involvement in politics becomes a reality in the life of the Christian who is concerned not in making politics a religious thing, but in using imagination and integrity in fulfilling responsibility to other men in the world.

The Church has a long way to go to closely relate evangelism to politics, but when we move closer to it, politics will become a

"language" for evangelism — the central task of the Church.

WILLIAM A. LUFBURROW
Minister
Windover Hills Methodist Church
6751 Ridge Road
Pittsburgh 36, Pennsylvania

A Roman Catholic in the White House. By James A. Pike (in collaboration with Richard Byfield). New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1960. 143 pages. $2.50

Since young Senator John Kennedy became a serious contender for our highest political office, a book exploring the compatibility of Roman Catholicism and the presidency has been inevitable. We have much to be thankful for in getting this book from the pen of Bishop James A. Pike, Episcopal Diocese of California, whose writing usually reflects sound scholarship and fair judgments. This explosive subject must receive a solid treatment or best be left alone.

Bishop Pike makes it clear at the outset that "This book is being written not to further the cause of bigotry but in an effort to avert it." He would not set up an unconstitutional religious test; he would merely have us look at some salient facts. Certainly Bishop Pike is qualified to explore the subject from many points of view, for he is both churchman and lawyer; and he has been a Catholic, an agnostic, and an Episcopalian in turn. As a churchman he looks with the eyes of faith; as a lawyer, he examines the complexities of certain tenets of Catholic canon law; as a Catholic, he relies upon his early religious training; as an agnostic, he calls upon the logic of the secular; and as an Episcopalian, he assays certain well-known and deep-seated Protestant prejudices against international Catholicism. He writes with authority and cogency, in a clear, predominantly unemotional style.

Bishop Pike thinks that the Papacy tolerates American Catholicism which has many interpretations of dogma in conflict with international Catholicism. As long as the American interpretation does not achieve notoriety in its construing of dogma, it will continue in vogue; but should public issues demand a stand by a Catholic, particularly a Catholic President, then traditional dogma would rear its head and demand precedence, even here in America.

American Catholicism asserts that the Roman Catholic Church supports separation of Church and State, yet Bishop Pike cites encyclical after encyclical in which various popes, speaking *ex cathedra,* have condemned separation as heresy. A Catholic must accept the Doctrine of Papal Infallibility, promulgated about 1870, and he must acknowledge it as retroactive. Bishop Pike finds little deviation throughout the years in the popes' attitudes toward the State: the Catholic Church is the *one true* church for every state, and every other denomination should be treated as heretic by the *one true* church which every state should recognize. To Bishop Pike, this dogma seems incompatible with the American politico-religious ideal, and he fears that the dogma may create serious problems for a Catholic in the White House.

One minor conflict may arise from the point of view that no Catholic may *participate* in a religious service of any other sect or denomination. The President of the United States must, of necessity, take part in the ceremonies of many different religious groups during his incumbency.

The American electorate needs a thorough knowledge of this pertinent subject, and Bishop Pike has given us the rudiments. He asks, "Are there any beliefs of the Roman Catholic Church that might impede the power of a President to fulfill his high office in accordance with American traditions?" His search for an answer is " . . . neither 'bigotry' nor the imposition of a 'religious test'; it is responsible citizenship." Happily, Bishop Pike respects our electorate or he would never have pioneered in answering at some length such a controversial question.

ORVAL J. ANDERSON
Associate Professor of English
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Buckhannon, West Virginia

BOOK NOTICES

John Wesley's Theology Today. By Colin W. Williams. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960. 252 pages. $4.50.

It has been said that Methodism is long on organization and short on theology. This impressive book by Dr. Williams goes a long way to dispel this statement. Wesley's theology

was much and "orthodox."

John Wesley's Theology Today treats in a scholarly but direct fashion the doctrines of salvation, original sin, repentance and justification, atonement, the Holy Spirit, the Church, perfection, and eschatology.

Every Methodist minister and all those Methodists interested in the ecumenical conversation should read this volume.

Religious Affections. By Jonathan Edwards. Edited by John E. Smith. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1959. 526 pages. $7.50.

Many historians of the psychology of religion refer to Jonathan Edwards as the first American psychologist of religion. After reading *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections,* first published by Edwards in 1736, it is easy to understand the reference. John E. Smith, the editor of this impressive volume and professor of philosophy at Yale University, has made a singular contribution to the understanding of the greatest eighteenth century theologian and religious leader of New England. The student of religious experience as well as the literary critic will find this volume fascinating reading.

How to Serve God in a Marxist Land. By Karl Barth and Johannes Hamel, with an Introduction by Robert McAfee Brown. New York: Association Press, 1959. 126 pages. $2.50.

This little volume consists of a letter written by Karl Barth in response to an East Zone pastor's question, "How are Christians to serve God in a Marxist land?" Karl Barth's answer, along with the added guidance of Pastor Harmel, will make most Americans uneasy, to say the least. The possibility that communism is but "God's instrument" will in itself disrupt Western thought patterns. But the added assertion that the West presents an atmosphere essentially as evil as that of the East will add insult to injury.

Barth's answer is simple and biblical: *God above all things!* And the phrase "all things" does not mean all things of the East only, but all things of the West as well. The famous Swiss theologian shows the gospel to be a hard lesson to hold to, no matter the Christian's geographical situation.

This little book will make the complaisant and pharisaical American angry and defensive. But of greater consequence is the very real possibility that Karl Barth may be dead right in his insightful and disturbing analysis!

Point of Glad Return. By Lance Webb. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960. 224 pages. $3.50.

This is another one of the many texts on the market today dealing with the ultimates of life. The author draws on a wide variety of source material, including contemporary authors such as Underhill, Ferre, Blanding, Scherer, Pike, Tillich, Peale, and Weatherhead; poetry; drama; Bible references; and experiences which form a part of nearly everyone's life.

Webb uses this source material and a lively style to make appealing what would otherwise be a boring repetition of scores of other books on the same subject. He includes a refreshing twist—a section on ambition, laughter, and health, reminding us that as we confront Christ in our frustrations and human frailties, so also must we confront him in our success and happiness.

The author prefaces his book with an introduction which leads one to acknowledge his right to deal with the subject matter and closes it with the currently demanded index.

The Almost Chosen People. By William J. Wolfe. New York: Doubleday, 1959. 215 pages. $3.95.

The author of this volume, Professor of Theology at the Episcopal Theological School, gives a fascinating picture of the religion of Abraham Lincoln. Here we see Lincoln as not only a practical mystic but a "biblical prophet." Professor Wolf does an admirable job of revealing Lincoln as a deeply religious person whose religiosity was never divorced from his politics.

The reader of this book cannot help but see the sheer ridiculousness of the current claim that it is possible to treat religion and politics as distinct entities. Filled with stimulating anecdotes and charming stories, this volume should be read by every Christian minister.

The Rule of God. By G. Ernest Wright. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1960. 133 pages. $2.95.

This little book by the Parkman Professor of Divinity at Harvard Divinity School consists of seven essays in biblical theology. Topics are: The Identity of God, The Nature of Man, Individual and Community, God Amidst His People, Security and Faith, The Rule of God, and The Gifts of God.

Thoroughly readable, scholarly, and written in the context of the best in archaeological and biblical scholarship, this volume should prove to be an excellent "sermon-starter" for the parish minister.

Calm Delight. By Elsie Chamberlain. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1960. 142 pages.

The atomic age has brought with it a deluge of reprintings and original devotional works. This one is excellent in every way. Dr. Chamberlain's rich experiences in the world of music and theology manifest themselves in her wise selections.

There are excerpts for thirty-one days. Taken from the writings of such persons as St. Augustine, Emil Brunner, Vincent Taylor, Soren Kierkegaard, and many more of like stature, these brief items fulfill the salient purpose of the volume: "To start you thinking—perhaps praying—each day of a month."

BOOKS RECEIVED

Brachvogel, A. E. *Friedemann Bach.* Tr. by Emanuel W. Hammer. New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1960. 209 pages. $3.00

Cole, William Graham. *Sex and Love in the Bible.* New York: Association Press, 1959. 448 pages. $6.50.

Coltrane, Charles. *Poetry for a Forlorn Soldier.* New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1959. 147 pages. $3.00.

Corwin, Virginia. *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1960. 293 pages. $5.00

Crook, Margaret B. *The Cruel God.* Boston, Mass.: The Beacon Press, 1959. 222 pages. $3.50.

Davis, James E. and Davis, Helen Newcastle. *Man's Study of Himself.* New York: Exposition Press, 1959. 80 pages. $2.50.

Ellsworth, Col. R. A. *Free World, Awaken!* New York: Exposition Press, 1959. 344 pages. $5.00.

Gallagher, Bernard J., Jr. *God, Man, and the Atomic Age.* New York: Exposition Press, 1959. 106 pages. $2.50.

Grant, Robert M., with Freedman, David Noel. *The Secret Sayings of Jesus.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1960. 206 pages. $3.50.

Grobel, Kendrick. *The Gospel of Truth.* New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. 206 pages. $4.00.

Heine, Heinrich. *Religion and Philosophy in Germany.* Tr. by John Snodgrass. Boston, Mass.: The Beacon Press, 1959. 177 pages. $1.45.

Hiltner, Seward. *The Christian Shepherd.* New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. 190 pages. $3.00.

Jackson, Mildred L. *Once-Upon-A-Time Bible Stories.* New York: Exposition Press, 1959. 234 pages. $3.75.

Knox, John. *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul.* New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. 110 pages. $2.00.

Landau, Rabbi Sol. *Christian-Jewish Relations.* New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1959. 78 pages. $2.50.

Landwer, Ida Koritz. *Heart to Heart Poems.* New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1959. 154 pages. $3.00.

Lewis, J. P. *The Divine Order and the Immortalization of Man.* New York: Exposition Press, 1959. 178 pages. $3.50.

MacGregor, Geddes. *Introduction to Religious Philosophy.* Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1959. 366 pages. $6.75.

McGhee, Joseph Llewellyn. *Musings and Memories.* New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1960. 64 pages. $2.50.

Milner, Esther. *The Failure in Success.* New York: Exposition Press, 1959. 205 pages. $3.50.

Purnell, J. M. *In His Pavilion.* New York: Exposition Press, 1959. 162 pages. $3.00.

Siman, Wajih Aziz. *The Dive that Changed My Life.* New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1960. 139 pages. $2.75.

Strunk, Orlo, Jr., Ed. *Readings in the Psychology of Religion.* New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. 288 pages. $4.50.